



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar. By J. B. GREENOUGH, G. L. KITTREDGE, A. A. HOWARD and BENJ. L. D'OUGE. Ginn & Co., Boston and London, 1903.

The task of the reviewer is a pleasant one in the case of a book which, like this, after many years of useful service has been revised by hands both sympathetic and competent. And lest perchance I find myself in the plight of many a friendly critic who discovers when near the end of his task that he has given pages to fault-finding and scarcely a line to praise, I may say at the outset that the work is excellently done, and that the well-tested value and usefulness of the book is correspondingly enhanced.

In looking through the volume somewhat carefully the student of syntax will note with interest some tendencies of the new book with reference to the principles of classification. In order to bring these out more clearly, it may be well to first state and illustrate the methods of classification in common use in our grammars. What may be styled primary classification is of two varieties, formal and functional; the first of these takes as its basis the syntactical form, the second deals with the meaning of the phrase. Thus the genitive may be divided formally into three classes, according as it depends upon a noun, an adjective or a verb, and the genitive dependent on a noun may be subdivided functionally into subjective and objective. In the revised grammar under discussion there is a manifest tendency to make formal classification the foundation of functional treatment. For example, the old edition (266 c) classes the independent concessive subjunctive with the subjunctive introduced by *quamvis*, *quamlibet*, *ut*, etc., making the meaning the basis of classification; while in the new book the subjunctive in dependent clauses is carefully distinguished from the independent use (440). Again, the new grammar brings together all the dependent clauses introduced by *quin* (558-59) instead of treating them in two different places according to the meaning assigned (see the old edition at 319 d, 332 g, and Rem.). Doubtless the changes of this sort would have been more numerous and sweeping had it not been for the desire to retain as far as possible the characteristic features of the earlier edition.

The classes resulting from formal and functional division are arranged in groups by what may be termed secondary classification. This is also of two varieties, logical and historical; the first of these methods produces an arbitrary and convenient scheme designed, e. g., to assist the memory in retaining certain facts; the second attempts to follow the line of historical develop-

ment from assumed original meanings. Logical classification is used most consciously in the grammar of Gildersleeve and Lodge, while that of Hale and Buck lays greater stress on the historical method. On the title page of the Allen and Greenough Grammar stands the legend "Founded on Comparative Grammar," and the original intention was doubtless to make historical classification a characteristic feature. Here again the hand of the reviser was probably stayed through a desire to maintain the integrity of the book; but it is easy to see that the historical treatment is felt to be unsatisfactory. The introductory note on the ablative (398) may serve as an illustration. In the earlier edition (242 n.) it is stated that "the ablative form contains three distinct cases,—the Ablative proper, expressing the relation FROM; the Locative, IN; and the Instrumental, WITH or BY," and the various uses of the Latin ablative are classified with reference to these assumed original meanings; but in the revision that paragraph is altered, "Under the name Ablative are included the meanings and, in part, the forms of three cases,—the Ablative proper, expressing the relation FROM; the Locative, IN; and the Instrumental, WITH or BY. *These three cases were originally not wholly distinct in meaning*<sup>1</sup>, . . .". I suppose that the last clause was intended primarily as a protest against the all too easy and prevalent assumption of fixed original meanings for case and mood forms, but as a matter of fact it also sweeps away the foundation of the historical classification that follows; for if originally ablative, locative and instrumental forms did not stand definitely for the meanings "from," "in," "with" or "by" respectively, but were used in a somewhat haphazard and shifting way within the general field covered by all these meanings taken together, the foundation stones of an historical classification are lacking, and the meanings "from," "in," etc., become convenient generalizations within which or about which to group the concrete uses of the Latin ablative. Such a classification is really logical rather than historical (in the sense in which that term is used above). The same tendency may be observed also at 436 § 3, where in place of a categorical statement as to the force of the subjunctive and optative in the parent speech (see earlier edition p. 274 § 2), the carefully worded paragraph runs, "Each mood *has*<sup>2</sup> two general classes or ranges of meaning. The uses of the subjunctive may all be classed under the general ideas of *will* and *desire* and of action  *vividly conceived*; and the uses of the Optative under the general ideas of *wish* and of action *vaguely conceived*."

These tendencies to make a formal treatment the basis in primary classification and to discredit the historical method as the dominant note in secondary classification deserve the most serious consideration. The fixed and unchanging character of the results of formal treatment admirably fit them to become the

<sup>1</sup> Italics mine.

<sup>2</sup> Italics mine.

basis of further classification, and in view of our lack of certain knowledge concerning the exact meanings originally attached to case and mood forms, it may well be questioned whether theories on that subject should not often be recorded in a footnote rather than made a basis of classification. This whole question really needs a thorough discussion, that the merits of the various methods may be clearly brought to light and that some clear-cut ideas may be formed as to the manner in which they can best be combined. Such a discussion could not fail to be of the greatest assistance to makers and revisers of grammars, and might tend to lessen the needless divergence in matters of classification which is now so prevalent.

That there is needless divergence no one will doubt; e. g. why might not all agree on a formal classification as the basis of the treatment of the genitive? What advantage is there in departing from the three-fold division of the genitive dependent on noun, adjective and verb? Needless divergence in classification (and more so in other matters) is even now a serious matter, and it bids fair to become no less so as time goes on and the newer grammars come into more general use. In the secondary school perhaps less trouble is caused, but even what might be styled legitimate divergence is often a distraction and source of confusion to classes in the early years of the college course. In this connection the revisers of the Allen and Greenough grammar are to be commended for the conservatism shown in the matter of terminology. The few innovations seem to be abundantly justified; for example, the lately discovered Annalistic Present appears at 469 a, and *si* is definitely recognized as a concessive conjunction at 527 c n. 2.

Many other points of excellence in the revision might be mentioned. It is a pleasure to find the ablative with *dignus* and *indignus* classed under Specification (418 b), and *ne* with the perfect subjunctive reduced from first to third place in the enumeration of the ways in which prohibition may be expressed (450). In the treatment of the Deliberative Subjunctive the occasional use of the indicative with like meaning is recognized (444 a n.), and attention is called to the exclamatory and rejecting nature of some of the questions usually brought under this head. As a matter of fact many of them are not in the slightest degree "deliberative," and it might be questioned whether this state of affairs should not be frankly recognized, and a distinctive name assigned to the class. It is with pleasure also that one finds the facts with regard to *cum*-temporal and *antequam* and *priusquam* given in a proper setting and sequence (544 ff. and 550 ff.). In 511 § 3 appears what is perhaps the best and clearest exposition of a very prevalent theory concerning the original form of conditional speaking; and 517 e n. 2, which deals with the history of the contrary-to-fact construction in Latin, is a model of brief and accurate statement. Under the heading of Conditional Clauses of Comparison, 524 a adds important and necessary information

on the subject of tense. These illustrations may serve to show how carefully the book has been worked over. It must not however be inferred that the revisers have allowed themselves a free hand in introducing changes; as a matter of fact they have allowed to stand many things of doubtful value, such for instance as the classification of conditional sentences which separates certain future conditions from others quite analogous in the realm of the present and the past.

The improved type-display is by no means the least important feature of the new book, and it is supplemented by the bringing out into a place of prominence of classes less advantageously placed in the earlier edition. See for instance the prominence given at 440 to the concessive use of the independent subjunctive, and to the Conative Present at 467. It is doubtless through a mere oversight that the (if anything) more important Conative Imperfect (471 c) is not treated in the same way. In this connection may be mentioned what seems to be another slip at 472 n.; apparently we should there read "protases" instead of "apodoses." At 485 c the types have again played the writer false, for there we read "In clauses of Result, the Perfect Subjunctive is regularly (the Present rarely) used after secondary tenses."

It is not enough that a grammar designed for general use should merely record fairly well the facts of Latin; it must also present them in such a way as not to mislead those who would make it a guide to the writing of Latin. Too often this double requirement is lost sight of, with the result that some definitions are either carelessly worded or biased in such a way by some theory (historical or otherwise) that they are as misleading to the student of Latin composition as they are false to the linguistic consciousness of the Romans. Whatever the reason for the original form, the revised Allen and Greenough retains several statements open to objection from this point of view; e. g. 485 g, which reads "The Imperfect and Pluperfect in conditions contrary to fact . . . are not affected by the sequence of tenses." If in this rule "conditions" means "protases," why not say so? As it stands the average student would inevitably think that both protasis and apodosis were referred to, and accordingly treat the pluperfect everywhere the same. Another example is afforded by 516 c "If the conditional act is regarded as completed before that of the apodosis begins, the Future Perfect is substituted for the Future Indicative in protasis, etc." My criticism of this statement is based not on theory but on difficulty experienced in actual practice. Give a thoughtful student this rule and the sentence "If he comes, send for me," and he perchance will see his way clear to writing nothing but *si venerit*, "because the coming is completed before the sending is to begin." To be sure the rule says "regarded as completed" and not simply "completed," but this distinction as applied to the case in hand only shifts the difficulty to another point; for we are then allowed to

write *si veniet*, though the action as a matter of fact is completed before that of the apodosis begins, but should the speaker "regard it as completed," then we are called on to use the form *si venerit*. Surely there is something wrong with the rule. Possibly the writer did not say exactly what he meant. Apparently the meaning intended is that the future perfect is used in protasis when the speaker selects a definite point in the future as the boundary within which the action of the protasis must take place to insure the coming to pass of the action of the apodosis; for instance, "If it shall have been done (e. g. before the beginning of the battle), we shall win." Whether this, without modification, would be an adequate rule for the writing of Latin is a question that I do not here raise.

The importance of this matter of precise definition is so great that I may, scholastica lege, allow myself the use of a third illustration. Section 441 deals with wishes, and lays down the rule, "The present tense denotes the wish as *possible*, the imperfect as *unaccomplished* in present time, the pluperfect as *unaccomplished* in past time." This statement makes no provision for an impossible future wish; e. g. "Would that this stone might turn into gold"—words spoken without the least hope or thought that the thing will come to pass, so that the subterfuge that the thing "is for the moment conceived of as possible" seems to be excluded; though what else is left for the large class of teachers who regard the grammar as the ultimate court of appeal, I do not see. Furthermore "unfulfilled in the present" is a phrase that falls short of the ideal; for we must use the imperfect subjunctive in translating a sentence like "Would that men were by nature good," and yet the unfulfilledness, so to speak, is not a thing of the present alone. The following rule (possibly suggested in part by Bennett, Lat. Gram. App. 365) avoids both these difficulties: "The present subjunctive is used in wishes that refer to the future, while the imperfect gives expression to a regret that something *is* or *is not*, the pluperfect that it *was* or *was not*." This rule is more consistent than the other in that it is based on time throughout, it covers the ground more completely, and its first clause is perhaps truer to Roman linguistic consciousness; it certainly is, if the phrase "wish as possible" was suggested by some theory with regard to an original or fundamental meaning of the subjunctive; for no such factor entered into the feeling of a Roman speaker. To him doubtless the present subjunctive in wishes covered the field left unoccupied by the other tenses of the subjunctive, and that part of the field was naturally the future.

In conclusion I may repeat what was said at the beginning. The work of revision is well and carefully done, and the hope of the publishers that old friends will be retained and many new ones gained ought to be in large measure realized.